

ady, it is my convinced judgment that the committee proposal is more essential than ever before in the fields of consumer frauds, quality, prices and productivity. The consumer has a burning interest in these fields which needs to be separately represented.

So I hope very much that the President of the United States will show an interest in real action and back the idea of a select committee on consumers or give us proposed legislation to provide a proper basis for a consumers' council in Government. There must be an area of Government in which the consumers' interests may adequately function as an active force in what is done by way of legislation as well as in the executive department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial published in today's issue of the New York Times on the subject, and a newsstory upon the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1962]

A BONE FOR CONSUMERS

The appointment by President Kennedy of a Consumers' Advisory Council so close to the start of the congressional campaign is bound to provoke some skepticism. The President expressed much interest in consumers in his 1960 election drive, but he waited until he had been in office a year and a half before naming this body. The pro forma interest the administration has displayed in following up the virtuous but somewhat vaporous proposals contained in Mr. Kennedy's omnibus message on consumer problems several months ago indicates little prospect of forceful new protection of consumer interests.

PRESIDENT NAMES CONSUMER PANEL—DEAN AT CORNELL IS CHAIRMAN OF ADVISORY COUNCIL.

WASHINGTON, July 18.—President Kennedy announced today the appointment of a 12-member Consumers Advisory Council to give broad consideration to the consumers' needs and point of view.

He named Dr. Helen G. Canoyer, dean of the School of Home Economics at Cornell University, to be its chairman.

Establishment of the council fulfills a campaign pledge made by Mr. Kennedy in 1960.

The pledge called for a White House assistant on consumer affairs. The unit announced today is a modified version of that and, in a way, more extensive because it sets up a consumer network throughout the executive branch.

The new council will report to the Council of Economic Advisers. Membership is not a full-time position. Compensation will be \$50 a day, when actually employed, and expenses.

The group will be assisted by a small staff and by liaison officers designated by 22 departments and agencies. The liaison work will be an addition to the regular duties of these departmental and agency employees.

Six of the new council appointees are women, six are men. Eight are Democrats, two are Republicans. Two others, including the chairman, recorded no party affiliation.

The members follow: Miss Helen G. Canoyer, David Angevine, Dr. Persla Campbell, Stephen McKenzie du Brul, Jr., Mrs. John G. Lee, Dr. Edward S. Lewis, Walter F. Mondale, Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, Mrs. Helen E. Nelson, Sylvia Porter, Dr. Caroline Ware, and Dr. Colston E. Warne.

Later today, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg announced the appointment of Mrs. Arnyess Joy Wickens as the Labor Department's liaison officer to the Consumers Council. Mrs. Wickens is a specialist in prices and standards of living.

UNITED STATES TIES ITS OWN HANDS IN MEETING SOVIET OIL OFFENSIVE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Monday I disclosed on the Senate floor the fact that an important study on the impact of Soviet oil exports on the free world was being held up within the Government by rigid and legalistic interpretations of our conflict-of-interest laws. At that time I warned that unless some effort was made to bring our cold war strategy into line with the trade threat which the free world is facing, we would be tying our own hands. The New York Times this morning reveals very clearly that the Soviets are still busily pushing their own advantage, while in the United States the chairman of the National Petroleum Council, a quasi-governmental agency, has resigned as a result of fundamental differences in the effort to meet the Soviet threat.

Mr. President, one of the most important projects which the National Petroleum Council was working on in cooperation with the Interior Department is a detailed and authoritative study of Soviet oil tactics. Up to this point our Government has developed no policy to meet this threat. We have not even had complete data on the extent of the threat. The purpose of the NPC study was to fill this gap and to discuss the oil industries of all the Communist countries including China and their needs and their present and potential impact throughout the rest of the world.

We had very impressive testimony about the huge oil reserves in Russia before our Committee on Internal Security. Reliable reports indicate that the NPC report, a draft of which has already been completed by the working subcommittee, is nearly 600 pages long plus charts and addenda. Yet, Mr. President, incredible as it may seem, this report, as well as the other activities of the National Petroleum Council have now been blocked. The Soviet oil report has been held up for a month already.

Mr. President, it is impossible for the United States to meet the worldwide Soviet threat under archaic concepts which prevent our own Government from using the brains, ability, and know-how of private enterprise to meet Soviet challenges. Particularly in the area of trade, it is vital that businessmen who actually conduct the trade be permitted to study, discuss, and make recommendations as to overall Government policy direction. It is obviously impossible for the members of the National Petroleum Council, most of which are important oil company executives, to be barred from dealing with the problems that are touched on in this report when they work in their private capacities. This would mean that these executives who have worked on this report may be unable to

serve their own companies in meeting the Soviet oil problem directly.

Mr. President, the Communists will not wait while we quarrel over our own laws and regulations. The newspaper this morning also carries a story of Soviet activities in this field. We can be sure that the Soviets are not idle when the free world is squabbling. Tass, the Soviet news agency, has just carried an interview with the head of the Oil Export Administration, an interview designed to quiet European fears and encourage European countries to take more Soviet oil.

Mr. Gurov, who is the head of the Oil Export Administration, has noted that last year Soviet oil accounted for only 8 percent of the total oil consumption in Common Market countries. He said the percentage was not expected to rise in the next few years, as both Soviet exports and West European consumption continue to increase.

Let us watch it. It will rise in the next few years. Mr. Gurov is making an inaccurate statement. It has been rising. It is going to continue to rise. It is going far beyond 8 percent unless we, with our allies, establish some coordinated policy. Mr. Gurov also said that the Soviet Union would not try to exert political pressure on its oil purchasers.

Furthermore, it is also reported in a separate report that the sale of Soviet oil "at dumping prices" in Western Europe will be one of the main subjects at the Fourth Arab Petroleum Congress in November. The foresighted chairman of the Lebanese delegation to the Congress, Emile S. Bustani, has already warned the Arab countries that Soviet oil exports will hurt them seriously. Sales in Western Europe by the western oil companies of Arab-produced oil bring big royalties and revenues to the Arab states. Soviet sales cut seriously into the Arab market.

In considering the Soviet oil menace, let us not forget the words of Soviet Premier Khrushchev. I hope I have not made a nuisance of myself in speaking on a number of occasions on this subject, but I feel very deeply on this matter, and it is a major concern to our Nation. As I say, we should not forget the words of Mr. Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier. He should know, if anyone knows, what his country is trying to do. He has said:

We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons.

It is time for the executive branch of the Government to wake up to the extent of the Soviet oil threat, and not tie its own hands through unnecessary and unrealistic conflict of interest interpretations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JAVITS. There is one thing my colleague from New York has not mentioned. The Senator and I have both been very much interested in this whole East-West trade problem and have

worked together on the Export Control Act. I refer to the antitrust laws, which also, as well as the conflict-of-interest laws, have a considerable effect on this situation.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Banking and Currency Committee will soon be considering some possibilities along this line, related to section 708 of the Defense Production Act, which permits the Attorney General to exempt certain arrangements from the antitrust laws in the national interest. I should like to call this to the attention of my colleague from New York and to the attention of all Members of the Senate, so that if they have any questions or any views or evidence which they would like to offer upon the subject as it relates to this matter of meeting Soviet competition in trade, the Banking and Currency Committee will be hearing evidence on these issues as they relate to pending amendments to the Defense Production Act.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague. I am aware of the fine work which he has done in this field. My understanding is that in this instance the holdup of the National Petroleum Council study is specifically based on a failure to come to grips with the problem of conflict-of-interest regulations for members of advisory groups. That is the reason why this Soviet oil report has been held up in the Department of the Interior for about a month. I first brought up and discussed the month-long delay in a statement on the Senate floor on Monday. Since then, the resignation of the head of the NPC has underscored the urgent need for a reconsideration of this aspect of our conflict-of-interest regulations.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is properly stating the reported reason for the holdup of this report, as referred to in the New York Times today. However, in the implementation of any activity under a report companies may immediately run afoul of the antitrust laws. I was merely pointing out that this is a two-stage operation. The Senate has properly dealt with the conflict-of-interest stage, which, incidentally, we have considered to some extent in the National Policy Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, as one hard nut that faces us. I was also pointing to a problem which is a corollary problem and is being considered by another committee of the Senate.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for many months I have been shocked and discouraged by the continuing anti-Semitic activities in the Soviet Union. Persecution, both official and unofficial, of members of the Jewish religion is, according to all reports, being stepped up to a new crescendo of religious discrimination and nationalistic racialism. It is not enough for the U.S. Government to express polite private regrets. There is a real need to expose Soviet hypocrisy on the subject, to reveal that prejudice and discrimination are rife throughout

the Communist empire, and to demonstrate the extent of Soviet intolerance before the whole world.

My inquiry about the latest trend of developments was first made to the U.S. Department of State in December 1961. I called attention to the serious problem of Communist persecution of Russian Jewry under the guise of routing out black marketeers and other so-called economic criminals. Under this cruel program a number of Jewish citizens have been executed or sentenced to long prison terms. It has become increasingly clear that the real aims of this phony economic campaign are the elimination of Judaism in the Soviet Union and, insofar as possible, of all organized religion. The situation in Russia now is becoming reminiscent of the pogrom conditions of the prerevolutionary era.

As the wave of anti-Semitic terror has mounted, many letters have come into my office protesting these activities of the Soviet Union and asking what the United States can do to counteract them. More than once, I have taken the question up with the Department of State requesting more detailed information and urging more vigorous protests on these activities.

The latest reply I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State, Frederick Dutton, discloses two new pieces of evidence in the Soviet anti-Semitic campaign. It reveals what I had suspected for some time, namely, that the Communist's long-term antireligion crusade has, in fact, been heightened in the last few months. The Soviet publication, Party Line, in an article of May 9, 1962, states that:

The Soviet Union has stepped up its anti-religious activities since the 22d party (Congress) and social organizations have recently strengthened what is described as "scientific religious propaganda"; that religious sects have been dissolved and that there has been an increase in the number of people who have renounced religious beliefs.

He further states that:

Allegedly at the request of former believers, many churches and prayer houses have been closed.

The criminal code now authorizes the prosecution of those engaged in religious activities, or even those who simply believe in God.

Soviet newspaper accounts have given prominence to Soviet citizens with Jewish names allegedly involved in illegal commercial activities. The State Department report indicates that the March issue of a prominent Soviet magazine, in exposing economic activities in the region of Frunze involving 54 offenders, listed the names of 33 persons, 15 of whom had identifiable Jewish names. The government appears to be attempting to link historic Russian anti-Semitism to its economic campaign, by these tactics and others. Detailed coverage is given in the Soviet press to criminals bearing Jewish names, and the attack is carried into every facet of daily life.

This letter from the State Department, however, has failed to mention many other aspects of the Russian anti-Semitic campaign in his letter. I sincerely hope that this does not indicate lack of

information in the Department on these matters. The letter does not mention, for instance, that Jews are being ousted continuously from their jobs and even their homes for mysterious reasons. It does not mention that there is but one Yeshiva left existing in the entire Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Moscow's Yaad-Yeshiva, headed by Rabbi Yehuda Leib Levin is the last theological seminary allowed to operate and then only under such nerve shattering conditions that those who enter must be specially prepared for the consequences of their action. It is easy for Mr. Khrushchev to maintain that Soviet Jewry is being treated like every one else, but these and many other facts clearly dispute his reasoning. This intensive campaign to stifle the practice of Judaism in the Soviet Union is intolerable, Mr. President, and must be stopped.

Mr. President, this letter from the Department has supplied the public with some new information, but it is far from complete. What disturbs me even more, however, is that apparently next to nothing is being done to protest these activities. On March 14, 1962, I called to the attention of this body a letter which I had received from Assistant Secretary Dutton in December 1961, answering questions similar to the ones I posed last week, and I compared that letter with the text of a memorandum which had come into my office 4 months later, purporting to be the "latest information" on the subject. I was shocked to discover, as I told this body then, that the letter and the memorandum were virtually word-for-word copies of each other. And I am dismayed to report now, that after another 4 months, nothing new has been added by way of positive action. About all that the Department of State can offer to those of us that are seriously concerned about this problem, is that President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev had anti-Semitism on the agenda of their talks at Camp David in 1960. Nothing new has apparently been done in the last 2 years.

The recent appointment of Veniamin E. Dymshits, a Jew, as Chairman of the State Planning Committee and Deputy Premier of the Soviet Union may be designed to quiet some of the mounting oversea criticism of Soviet anti-Semitism. But despite the religious heritage of Mr. Dymshits, there is no evidence that he has practiced the Jewish religion himself; in fact, as a practicing and active Communist and a member of the Central Committee, he has undoubtedly foresworn the faith of his fathers. Perhaps also his appointment may be designed to tempt other Soviet Jews with the lure of political preferment as a reward for religious apostasy.

Mr. President, in other times men have been warned not to desert the Lord for Mammon. In the Soviet Union the danger is that they will desert the Lord, not for Mammon, but for Marx.

I admit that there is only a narrow range of diplomatic action possible, given the nature of this problem, but our diplomats may have not even explored this limited area thoroughly. In the last 8 months, I have received three separate

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13155

communications from the Department of State on this subject. The last is as inconclusive as the first. The Department has not even redrafted the form letter. Whole paragraphs are identical in each of them.

Mr. President, the perfect opportunity now exists for the United States to exert some leadership on this very serious problem. In a short time, the Senate will be asked to give its advice and consent to the nomination of a new Ambassador to the Soviet Union. And shortly after that, our new envoy, Mr. Foy Kohler, an experienced career diplomat, will present his credentials in Moscow and begin a round of diplomatic consultations.

I therefore urge the administration specifically to instruct the new American Ambassador to the Soviet Union to place high on his agenda of talks with the Russians consideration of the problem which I have been discussing here. I urge our Ambassador be instructed to exert all the influence he has at his command to express the vital concern of the American people in this problem and to exercise all the moral suasion possible to bring about some amelioration of the conditions now existing for the Soviet Jew.

Now is the time to act. The moment is here as evidence of anti-Semitic campaigns mount day by day, and as a new American envoy prepares to assume his duties in the Soviet capital. To act firmly on this problem as exemplified in the Soviet Union would be a powerful precedent, a notice served on the nations of the world which tolerate or tacitly encourage anti-Semitism within their borders, that the United States is concerned, and that the United States is prepared to bring all its energies and influence to bear on the solution of the problem.

Already we have seen enough recent evidence of a revival of anti-Semitism in other parts of the world to suspect that the Russian example or Soviet influence may have had its effects outside the geographic borders of the Communist empire.

In Algeria, for instance, the plight of the Jews—as of all non-Moslems—stands in striking contrast to the worldwide celebration which has been made at the news of the independent Algerian state. It is a shame and a crime that suffering and persecution of a portion of these supposedly “free” people should be allowed to cloud the unanimous joy and relief over the end of the long and bloody war with France.

But cloud it, it does. The new Algerian Government has, in spite of its protestations, begun a campaign of so-called nationalization which will effectively force the Algerian Jewish community either to leave the country or to shut itself off from the world in a gloomy and hopeless ghetto. We are all familiar with the themes of nationalism—a return to national customs and language, the growth of a national middle class, association with other newly independent states, and so forth. In Algeria, where the Jewish population is sizable and long established, every one of these

tendencies has led to anti-Semitic persecution.

Particularly cruel in Algeria—with about 135,000 Jews—is the fact that a government which should be representing all of its people may be joined with the Pan-Arab movement in a campaign against the State of Israel and its so-called Zionist intrigues. What appears to be happening in Algeria, Mr. President, is a sinister distortion of that high-sounding slogan for national independence—instead of “Algeria for the Algerians,” we have “Algeria for the Moslems.”

The result is racial discrimination and persecution of serious proportions. Thousands of Jews are fleeing the country every day; Jewish communal life in Algiers has practically disappeared, and there are many instances recorded of street battles between the FLN and Jewish citizens, many instances of suffering and death.

I might point out, Mr. President, that the situation in Algeria, bad as it is, compares favorably with the situation in other parts of North Africa where Jews have been consigned to restricted ghettos, and considered far inferior even to the lowest of Moslems. Many of these Jews are effectively shut off from the rest of the world, dependent upon the United Jewish Appeal movement for even some minimum amount of food, clothing, and education.

The acrimony and persecution in North Africa continues, Mr. President. To some extent, we have come to expect the birth pangs of a new nation to be accompanied by trouble and hardship. But in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, the Jews have had to bear a disproportionate share of the hardship. Latent anti-Semitism has flared and, as in the past, the Jews have become the scapegoats for impatient nationalists.

With these recent outrages in mind, Mr. President, I think it would help, not harm, the situation for our new Ambassador in the Soviet Union to make strong representations on this issue early in his mission. To do this is in accordance with American principles. It is an act of very real concern and importance not only to the millions of American Jews who are deeply troubled by the fate of their religious brethren in Russia and elsewhere, but also to the 180 million Americans of all races and religions who believe in the world of brotherhood, the dignity of man, and the liberties which have given our Nation its enduring strength. It is a moral obligation which I sincerely trust our Government will not ignore.

THE CORRECTION OF EXPENSE ACCOUNT ABUSES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in a message to Congress on April 20, 1961, President Kennedy stated that “widespread abuses have developed through the use of the expense account. Indeed, expense account living has become a byword in the American scene.”

The Secretary of the Treasury, in making specific recommendations to the

Ways and Means Committee, on May 3, 1961, for corrective legislation in the expense account area, stated that an audit had recently been made by the Internal Revenue Service, and “although this audit covered only 38,000 returns, it shows that these returns claimed deductions totaling \$5.7 million for club dues, \$2 million for theater tickets and similar amusements, over \$1 million for hunting lodges and fishing camps, \$2.6 million for yachts, and \$11.5 million for business gifts. Most significantly, the audit shows that only a small portion of these expenses can be disallowed under existing law.”

In view of the obvious abuses and the Secretary's statement that existing law does not deal adequately with the problem, it would seem only reasonable to suppose that the Congress would move decisively and promptly to give the Internal Revenue Service the tools it needs to protect the public interest against these widespread abuses.

H.R. 10650, the tax bill, as passed by the House, dealt with the expense account problem, but somewhat tenderly. I was disappointed that the provision was not a stronger one.

But my disappointment has been doubled by the action of the Finance Committee of the Senate on this same subject. Not only has the Finance Committee failed to follow the recommendation of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to amend the law to treat effectively with this tax abuse, but, even worse, the committee adopted an expense account amendment which is far worse than the inadequate provision of the House-passed bill. Indeed, it may be worse than the existing law under which the widespread abuses occur.

This amendment was described in the committee by its author as “the prudent man” amendment. In argument against it I asked for the dictionary and read to the committee the following and, I think, appropriate definition of the word “prudent”:

Habitually careful to avoid practical errors and to follow the most profitable and politic course; especially attentive to one's own interest; worldly wise—as “A prudent man foreseeth the evil and hideth himself.”

I have personal affection for each member of the Senate Finance Committee, but much to my regret my conception of the public interest is frequently at sharp variance with the action of the majority of the committee; that is surely true in this instance as well as in many others.

It will be my purpose, therefore, to join with other of my colleagues who are interested in correcting some of the more obvious and wholly unjustified abuses which now exist in our Internal Revenue Code in an earnest endeavor to rewrite the tax reform bill on the floor of the Senate at such time as it may be called up by the leadership for action.

It is not easy, I realize, to write tax legislation on the Senate floor, but in my view in this instance it cannot be avoided. The effort must be made, and I trust it will be successful.

13156

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 19

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1962—
CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2996) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, recently the Senate marched strongly up the hill to express its opposition to aid to Communist countries and adopted an amendment by the Senior Senator from Ohio to bar such aid to Communist countries. But the next day the Senate rather timidly marched back down the hill and greatly diluted that action with a nullifying amendment.

Whether one is for aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland—and neutralist India—or not, I think most everyone would acknowledge the extremely good sense expressed in an editorial in the July 13, 1962, issue of the Wall Street Journal entitled "A Weak Political Tool" and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD for everyone to read—not only to read but to study.

I think it puts the finger on one of the greatest weaknesses in the policies and administration of our foreign aid program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WEAK POLITICAL TOOL

The congressional criticism of foreign aid this year centers on three countries: Poland, Yugoslavia, and India. Each case tells a good deal, we think, about what is wrong with the aid program as a whole.

Poland and Yugoslavia, of course, are Communist countries, the one a Soviet satellite, the other not. Whether they get any more aid, and if so how much, is now up to a House conference committee.

To some critics the fact that they are Communist should automatically bar them from aid consideration. But that is not the central question; it is, or should be, whether any significant U.S. interest is served by the aid.

In the beginning the answer may well have been affirmative. After Tito of Yugoslavia broke with Stalin in 1948, it was in the American interest to have him remain independent, and American aid helped serve that purpose. Somewhat similarly, after Poland's Gomulka wrested some internal autonomy from Khrushchev in the wake of a near-revolt in 1956, it seemed sensible to try to help him keep it. Divisions and turmoil in the Communist camp are almost by definition gains for us.

But because something may have been useful at one time is no excuse for doing it forever. Any semi-independence Poland enjoys today isn't benefiting the United States and probably has nothing to do with whether U.S. aid is granted or not. In the cold war arena, Yugoslavia has become practically indistinguishable from the Soviet Union. In each case any new aid would simply be a handout, with no clear function from the viewpoint of American interest.

And this trap is what the United States has fallen into all over. By letting people get the impression that the aid is to be a permanent subsidy, we rob it of flexibility and effectiveness as a political tool.

Certainly that is the sorry circumstance in India. The aid, in our opinion, should not be terminated merely because anyone gets mad at Nehru for his constant carping at this country, his "neutrality" or even his buying of Soviet Migs if he decides to do that. As everywhere else, the criterion should be what U.S. interest the aid is aiding.

On that basis, it would be hard indeed to justify the very considerable amount of aid the United States is giving India. Certainly it cannot be argued that the help has kept India from going Communist. India has not gone Communist because enough Indians oppose it despite Nehru's philosophical affection for the ideology, because the Communist Party in India is not strong enough, and because neither the Soviet Union nor Red China has yet tried to take the whole nation by force. The Chinese border incursions have done more than United States aid to make Indians anti-Communist.

We are aware that the further argument is that India must be aided so as to strengthen its economy and hence its democratic political institutions. Unfortunately, the aid may have done more harm than good. Today India is in deplorable economic and financial shape, not least because it is trying to run a socialist economy which the U.S. aid has inevitably helped to entrench. This kind of thing is also being duplicated around the world. The truth is that we are trying to do too much and too often we are doing the wrong things.

A real reform of foreign aid would have to cover a great deal. But surely its beginning should be a case-by-case analysis of aid as it affects the American interest. And just as surely the beginning of aid wisdom must be to make it perfectly clear that the help is limited not only in scope but duration.

The U.S. Government has already waited far too long to make that beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to postpone the further consideration of the conference report until August 1. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 122 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Anderson	Dworshak	Murphy
Bartlett	Eastland	Neuberger
Beall	Ellender	Pearson
Bible	Ervin	Proxmire
Boggs	Fong	Robertson
Bottum	Gruening	Russell
Bush	Hruska	Scott
Butler	Jordan	Talmadge
Capehart	Kuchel	Thurmond
Carlson	Lausche	Tower
Cotton	McClellan	Wiley
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morse	Young, Ohio
Dodd	Mundt	

NAYS—48

Alken	Hill	Morton
Burdick	Holland	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Pastore
Cannon	Jackson	Pell
Carroll	Javits	Prouty
Case	Keating	Randolph
Church	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Maine
Engle	Magnuson	Sparkman
Gore	Mansfield	Stennis
Hart	McCarthy	Symington
Hartke	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Hayden	McNamara	Yarborough
Hickey	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—11

Allott	Fulbright	Long, La.
Bennett	Goldwater	Monroney
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Moss
Chavez	Johnston	

So Mr. MORSE's motion was rejected. Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, in order that I may propound an inquiry?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for that purpose.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of today. I understood that the conference report on the welfare bill was to be taken up next. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I do not know how much longer the Senate will proceed on the conference report on the foreign-aid bill; but it is anticipated that following the completion of action on that conference report, the Senate will then take up the conference report on the welfare bill. I do not know how long the consideration of that report will take.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]—assuming that he will submit the conference report on the welfare bill—whether he anticipates that its consideration will take very long.

Mr. KERR. I hope not. Of course, I cannot presume to have knowledge of what other Senators may do; but I hope